Kennedy and Birth Control, P. 4

Question for Khrushchov: If Rakosi Was to Blame in Hungary, Why Are His Critics in Jail? P. 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 46 DECEMBER 7, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Chinese Communists Dig Up Kublai Khan

Coleridge would have been delighted with the Indo-Chinese crisis. I have been reading the two White Papers issued by the Indian government and a Yellow Book, "Concerning the Question of Tibet", published by Peking. In the latter, to support China's right to govern Tibet, I found the Communists invoking Kublai Khan, whom I had thought of as a figment of Coleridge's poetic trances. It seems Kublai not only decreed himself a pleasure dome in Xanadu but made his contribution five centuries in advance to the current controversy. In 1275 the Khan graciously recognized a certain Pagspa as jointly the religious and political ruler of Tibet, initiating what our devout press calls "God-king" rule, but of course under Peking's suzerainty. The Indians, in this opening fusillade of historical documentation, disdain such relatively recent events. New Delhi goes back to the *Rig-Veda,* about 1,500 B.C. and the *Kena Upanishad,* about 1,000 B.C., to prove that the Himalayan border regions now in dispute, though often overrun by Tibetans and Chinese, were always part of India. "The *Bhagavad Gita,* describing the perfection of the Almighty," says the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, clinching the argument with a quotation from the Hindu Bible, "states that of immovable things He is the Himalayas."

A Road in No Man's Land

When one descends from these sublime heights to the actual border dispute, the atmosphere turns murky. The Chinese built a road from Sinkiang to Tibet across one of these high uninhabitable plateaus in 1956. Two years later the Indians protested that it crossed a part of Ladakh which has been Indian since 1842. There is probably no other place in the world where one country could build a road across part of another country without that other country knowing about it immediately. At other disputed points, the news seems to have travelled less leisurely. On the Northeast Frontier, at the other end of this 2500-mile border, a Chinese officer and 50 men penetrated into Indian territory in September 1958. New Delhi found out about the invasion in less than three months. One of the early clashes concerned a Tibetan official who collected a grazing tax from Indians tending goats in an area India claims is Bara Hoti and part of India but which the Chinese claim is Wu-je and part of Tibet. Then there was a dispute about two check posts on what the Indians claimed was their side of the Balcha Dhura Pass. The Indian protest explained that these border posts are evacuated by their guards at the end of the summer months "due to climatic conditions." "The government of India has been informed" that when its guards withdrew for the winter, Chinese personnel took over. Even in the prosaic words one can feel the cold, lonely desolation.

Just where the border should be in these icy mountain passes is not easily decided. "Indeed," Nehru admitted in a letter of Sept. 26 to Peking, "the terrain of the Sino-Indian border in many places makes such physical demarcation on the ground impossible." In the East there is the McMahon line which the Chinese never formally accepted. In the West, including Ladakh, the frontier has never been delimited. The differences strategically are of no real consequence. India has never been invaded from Tibet; this border is a series of Thermopylae difficult of approach from either side. Yet petty border quarrels began in 1954; prisoners were taken and shots exchanged; some soldiers were killed; each side blamed the other; ill-feeling grew. Then came the Tibetan revolt last March, the flight of the Dalai Lama. Suddenly this became a sensitive border. As Nehru told a press conference Oct. 23, "There were no Chinese forces on the other side of the border before the Tibet rebellion. But after the rebellion Chinese forces came partly to crush the rebellion and partly to stop the Tibetan people from coming to India." When there were Indian demonstrations of sympathy with Tibet, and a crowd in Calcutta threw tomatoes at a picture of Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese called this "an act of connivance" and "a huge insult" for which Peking would not cease to demand satisfaction "even for one hundred years." It was as if a holy image had been defaced.

Overnight Gandhi and Non-Violence Are Forgotten

So all the pledges of *Panchen Shila* began to fade. The quarrel shows how little the conduct of men and nations is affected by great Teachers and great Revolutions. The people of Gandhi and the leaders of the new China are as ready to fight over a few barren acres as their benighted forerunners. Millions of Indians who never saw a Himalaya, too lethargic to fight against disease, superstition and misery, are ready to march lest a few distant areas change colors on maps few of them can even read. Leaders like Jayaprakash Narayan and Asoka Mehta who are supposed to be saintly spoke as light-headedly in the Indian Parliament's foreign policy debate last week as the silliest Austrian courtier in August, 1914. Mehta even suggested that Nehru was wrong in not trying to utilize the "threat to our frontiers" in order to "create national cohesion," i.e. to mobilize the people by the drums of fear and hate. Nehru deserves world applause for standing firm against the mob spirit at home and against the rudeness of Peking. War between India and China would be no backyard brawl; it could not be contained. Even prolonged hostility between the two countries would cost dearly in the diversion of resources from their fight against poverty. We have reason to believe that Eisenhower, like Khrushchov, is exerting a good influence behind the scenes.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Can "Cult of Personality" Be Ended, If Men Fear to Combat It?

If Rakosi Was to Blame in Hungary, Why Are His Critics in Jail?

Last summer, when the Greek Communist editor and war hero, Emanuel Glezos was on trial on trumped up charges of espionage, Soviet President Voroshilov addressed an appeal to King Paul of Greece on his behalf; crowds demonstrated in Moscow before the Greek Embassy; *Pravda* covered the trial.

But when Tibor Dery, an old Communist militant and one of the masters of Hungarian prose, and Gyula Hay, a leading Hungarian dramatist, who spent the Horthy years in exile in Moscow, were brought to trial on trumped up charges of counter revolution, the trials were held in secret. No foreign correspondents were admitted. Appeals for clemency on behalf of imprisoned Hungarian editors and writers by the International Pen Club and by the United Nations were contemptuously rejected.

Premier Khrushchov in his speech to the Hungarian Party Congress last week put the primary blame for the Hungarian revolt on the abuses of the Rakosi regime. But can he deny that Sir Leslie Munro in his report a few days earlier to the United Nations on Hungary spoke the truth when he said these writers were imprisoned for the part they played in protesting "the oppressive practices" of the regime which Khrushchov himself criticizes?

Khrushchov Defends Himself

Khrushchov's speech in Hungary contains a passage which seems to reflect criticism of himself in the inner councils of the Kremlin. He recognizes that the revelations he made about the Stalin regime at the Twentieth Congress created "certain difficulties, something of a fever" in many of the Communist parties such as Hungary's. It was in fact the Khrushchov speech that sparked the revolt.

Khrushchov says that "some people have said . . . that the question should not have been raised so sharply." He defends himself and says "it had to be done. It was necessary to get cleansed. . . ." It was necessary to attack "the mistakes produced by the cult of personality." Why, then, are those who spoke out most courageously in Hungary against those mistakes in jail while the time-servers return to power?

We come here again to the inadequacies of the "cult of personality" concept. Why did it grow up? Because even the most loyal Communists were afraid to speak out lest they be denounced as counter-revolutionaries. Because they knew that if so accused there were no firm safeguards which would assure them of a chance to have a fair trial.

Because honest men were afraid to speak, Khrushchov made the mistake of replacing Nagy with Rakosi in 1954, and of keeping the old scoundrel in power in 1956 long after it was obvious that a new regime was needed in Hungary. Had Rakosi been cashiered in the spring of 1956 and Kadar freed from jail at that time to head a new regime with Nagy, the terrible events of October-November might have been avoided. And a reformed Hungarian regime responsive to the better elements of the country and the Communist party would have been a great help in the struggle for peace and co-existence. As it is, Hungary haunts Khrushchov.

The U. S. in raising the Hungarian issue at the United Nations may indeed be more interested in making cold war propaganda than in helping the Hungarian people. Nora Beloff, back from a three week trip to Hungary, reports in the London *Observer* (Nov. 29) that Hungarians have "no use for our oratorical solicitude" and see their only hope in a general relaxation of the international atmosphere. "For many anti-Communists there," she writes, "it may make the difference between freedom or arrest, continued imprisonment or amnesty. . . . For a far wider group it means the ending of intellectual claustrophobia. . . . For tens of thousands of heart-broken Hungarian families it is the ony chance of recovering contact with missing refugee members."

In this sense, Khrushchov in his own way, by trying to crack the ice, is moving in a hopeful direction; his fall from power if his efforts fail would almost certainly lead to a reaction back toward Stalinist methods in the Kremlin. But we hope the Russian leaders are not blinded by their own cliches about Hungary. It is a confession of weakness, not strength, that they should fear a visit from a UN commission of inquiry; that they dare not withdraw the Red Army; that they should have to punish savagely some of the greatest names in Hungarian literature and journalism; that they should have to resort in Hungary to the Stalinist methods they boast of having abandoned in the Soviet Union.

All Eastern Europe west of the Soviet border will continue to be basically unstable as long as the Communists cannot find a genuinely popular and national basis for their rule. The iron hand may work but only at the cost of future explosions and these will be terribly dangerous for the world peace they and we desire.

Crisis in the Krupp Empire

We note in the London Times of Nov. 28 that a tragedy has befallen the Krupps. Everything had been in readiness for a campaign to repeal the allied occupation law requiring Krupp to dispose of his steel and coal holdings. Krupp has been arguing that no one was bidding to buy them. In the close knit family of German capitalism, no one would dare.

But now a Dutch scrap dealer, Louis Worms, has offered to buy the Krupp steel works at Rheinhausen. "This offer," the Bonn correspondent of the London Times reported, "presumably prompted Herr Krupp and his managing director, Herr Beitz, to call on Dr. Adenauer and afterwards Herr Beitz flew off to the United States." Perhaps it is hoped that U. S. pressure through the Dutch government may persuade Herr Worms to withdraw his impertinent bid.

Intimate Question for "Rocky"

Though carried by the Associated Press wire and printed by the Washington Evening Star, most newspapers next morning, including the New York Times, published nothing on the hearing held Dec. 1 by the House Ways and Means Committee on the depletion allowances by which the American oil industry largely escapes income and profits taxes.

Since Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York has been suggesting that the rest of us pay higher taxes to support a stepped up arms race, we wonder whether any New York newspapers will have the temerity to ask him how he feels about depletion allowances. Or is that too intimate a family matter?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Shouldn't Government Propaganda Scripts Be Labelled As Such?

That TV Play "Security Risk" Was Army Public Relations Not Art

The Armstrong Circle Theatre presented a drama called "Security Risk" over TV on Nov. 25. It dealt with the clearance of a scientist for an Army job. The *New York Times* reviewer, John P. Shanley, commenting on it two days later, said the play "offered a refreshing reminder" that security procedures "when properly pursued" can "lead to vindication as well as to condemnation of a suspect."

The reminder would have seemed a good deal less refreshing if the play had carried captions telling viewers frankly that it originated in the Army's public relations section, and had been prepared in collaboration with the Counter Intelligence Corps.

The sophisticated viewer guessed something of this sort when the play ended with a shot of Major Gen. Wm. W. Quinn, chief of U. S. Army Information. The General explained that the play showed clearance procedures were not "a witch hunt" but were designed to "protect our freedom."

Frank Admissions at The Pentagon

The General's epilogue stirred our curiosity. We called the Pentagon next day to ask whether the Counter Intelligence Corps had a hand in this TV play. We were finally shunted to something called the "audio-visual branch."

There an officer told us that this branch keeps in "almost constant contact" with film and TV producers, that the idea for this particular play originated "here," i.e. with the audio-visual branch, and that the Counter Intelligence Corps cooperated in "working up the script."

The hero of the play was a scientist whose aid was asked by the Army. The scientist was soon involved in trouble by clearance procedures. An anonymous letter accused him of being a Communist. When CIC checked with the FBI, the latter's criminal branch declared him "clean" but its subversive file showed blemishes on his record.

The scientist had been quoted in the Soviet press on nuclear policy. He was a sponsor of a Committee for the Freedom of American Science which was on the Attorney General's list. A South African paper called "Conscience" had quoted him as accusing the U. S. of spreading Strontium 90 by secret nuclear testing. He had received copies of a subversive paper called "Arise" issued by a Patrick Henry Association. His son was a dues paying member of this association.

Just what was subversive about any of these publications or associations was not explained. The viewer certainly got the idea that young men who hoped to do scientific work for the government would do well to avoid criticism of nuclear policy and keep out of organizations which concerned such controversial matters as the freedom of science or bore suspicious names like those of Patrick Henry.

All turned out well in the end, however. The Soviet press and "Conscience" had misquoted the scientist. He had become a sponsor of the free science committee without realizing it; his son was only 19 when he joined the Patrick Henry Association and had resigned after a year. There is a shot in which the scientist realizes with a shock that he should have spent more time with the boy to keep him straight. He himself traces the anonymous note to the janitor of an apartment house in which he once lived; the janitor bore him a grudge. Father and son are cleared in the end by a benign CIC.

A Less Happy Ending in Real Life

A somewhat different play might have been written which would have given another picture of how these clearances often work. The janitor with a grudge might have turned up as an informant who asked that his information be kept confidential. In that case the scientist would never have gotten a chance to face his accuser and demonstrate that this was an old grudge. The scientist would have lost his reputation and the Army would have lost his services.

We hear a great deal in this country about how literature in the Soviet Union has to serve the government and the party. When our military bureaucracy and our secret services work with film and TV writers and producers on scripts which glorify their activities, we too are slipping into the same Orwellian habits.

This is propaganda and ought to be clearly labelled as such. It is more noxious than false toothpaste advertising or rigged quiz shows. It rigs the public mind.

What Most Liberal Editors Fear to Say on Teacher Informers and Loyalty Oaths

New York City's refusal to reinstate five teachers despite court orders upholding their refusal to act as informers has again drawn an editorial protest from the New York Times (Nov. 30) which does that paper honor. But the basic issue —the right of teachers to teach irrespective of their political opinions—still makes liberal editors quail.

"Consistently opposed as we are to permitting Communists to teach in the schools," said the Times editorial, "we do not believe that requiring men and women to become informers under penalty of dismissal is a good or reasonable way of guarding against subversion." But to accept the premise is to make it difficult to avoid the conclusion. The fundamental syllogism of all witch hunts start with an assumption of danger so baneful as to make respectable the inference that normal standards may be suspended. If one accepts the view that Communists are so supernaturally noxious that they may be barred without proof of wrongdoing, how combat the view that it then becomes a sacred duty to inform upon them? The miasma can only be cleared up by a return to first principles—the right of every citizen to pursue any calling unless proven guilty of some crime.

In this connection we wish liberal editors would abandon the cowardly argument that loyalty oaths are wrong because only non-Communists—Communists being ipso facto bad—would hesitate to take them. To risk a five year term in jail for perjury is a serious matter. The threat works not only against Communists but against others who may honestly feel that they can take a loyalty oath or disclaim membership in subversive organizations but fear later prosecution in a change of climate when a prosecutor may take a different interpretation of what constitutes loyalty and that vaguest of all categories, "subversion." The effect is to make students and others subject to such oaths decide that discretion is the better part of citizenship and eschew membership in all organizations. This is the real argument against the oaths—their inhibitory effect on the exercise of First Amendment rights, and their tendency to spread a dull conformity and an uneasy anxiety.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Authoritative New Study Show 67% of U. S. Catholic Families Use Contraceptives

One Birth the Bishops Prevented Is A Catholic for President

The Roman Catholic Bishops in their statement against birth control cited favorably the view expressed by a Russian delegate at the United Nations Economic Commission on Asia. "The key to progress," they quote him, "does not lie in a limitation of population . . . but in the speedy defeat of the economic backwardness of these countries." The Bishops hastened to add, lest they be thought Marxistic, "The Communist record of contempt for the value of human life gives the lie to this hypocritical propaganda but to peoples aspiring to economic development . . . the deceit is not immediately evident." We ourselves, though not under-developed, would have been taken in if Their Eminences had not set us straight.

Kennedy Courageous for The First Time

The immediate effect of the Bishops' pronouncement may be to abort the possibility of electing a Catholic President next year. Senator John F. Kennedy, who managed to keep discreetly silent on McCarthy all through the years of the latter's ascendancy, chose birth control as the issue on which to be courageous for the first time in his career. His swift endorsement of the stand by the Bishops may cost him his chances for the Democratic nomination and the Presidency in a country which still regards separation of church and state as fundamental.

This is one issue on which Kennedy could have kept silent without losing even Catholic votes. An authoritative study, the first of its kind, published this year by the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems at the University of Michigan (*Family Planning, Sterility and Population Growth* by Freedman, Whelpton and Campbell) shows that 85 percent of our Protestant and 67 percent of our own Catholic families are users of contraceptives.

Birth control is a fairly new issue; its pioneers were prosecuted in England in the 1870's and here as recently as 1916. The Pope did not speak out against it until 1930, the year the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Church reversed itself and accepted birth control. While Pius XI in his encyclical, *Casti Connubii* (Chaste Wedlock), invoked authority as ancient as St. Augustine's against birth control, the latter in the passage quoted was really citing Scripture against onanism not modern birth control, and it is not clear whether Onan was condemned for spilling his seed upon the ground or for failing to do his duty according to Mosaic law by his dead brother's widow.

The Church invokes natural law against birth control but its conception of nature is derived not from the Stoics but from Paul, who reluctantly tolerated sex—even in the marital state—as a necessary evil. In any case, there is a wide difference among *coitus interruptus*, sterilization, abortion and planned parenthood by contraceptives just as there is only a thin line between the last and that "natural rhythm" method of birth control the Church permits. The Church may come around to planned parenthood as it has come to accept evolution, and other heresies.

The theological ingenuity which is prepared to hasten millions out of this world via "just wars" should not find it impossible to accept the idea of spacing their entrance into it more intelligently.

Criminals and Political Heretics

Those who read for themselves the decision by Mr. Justice Douglas in Henry v. U. S. and the dissent by Mr. Justice Clark will see that this ruling has been highly overrated. The fact that Chief Justice Warren joined in the Clark dissent is indicative. The question at issue was whether FBI men arresting two thieves engaged in looting interstate shipments had "probable cause" for their action. The facts made it a very close question since a preliminary tip and extensive surveillance made this no simple case of arbitrary arrest. What annoys us is that Justices like Frankfurter and Harlan are prepared to take an ultra-strict view of the Fourth Amendment on search and seizure but engage in nullificatory "balancing acts" when the First Amendment comes up as in Barenblatt and Sweezy. If one amendment can be "balanced", why not another? The fact is that here—as in the Soviet Union—it is much easier for judges to uphold basic safeguards in the case of criminals than in those of politicals.

IFS Speaks on "Is McCarthyism Really Dead?" at All-Souls Unitarian Church, Wash., 9:45 a.m. Sun., Dec. 13

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

12/7/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. STONE TO GET TOM PAINE AWARD

at the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee's annual dinner on Bill of Rights Day. Senator Stephen M. Young of Ohio and Myles Horton of Highlander Folk School will speak, and Judge Hubert T. Delaney will be toastmaster. The Hotel New Yorker, 7 p.m., Dec. 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED